DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 928 CG 013 729

AUTHOR Kenrick, Douglas T.; And Others
TITLE A Step in the Socialization of Altruism as Hedonism: Effects of Negative Mood on Children's Generosity under Public and Private Conditions.
PUB DATE [78]
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Altruism; Attitudes; *Behavior Development; Child Development; *Children; Developmental Stages; *Helping Relationship; Motivation; Prosocial Behavior; *Psychological Patterns; *Socialization

ABSTRACT

Prior research has indicated that, although negative mood induction procedures reliably lead to enhanced helping in adults, such procedures do not produce increased helping in young children. Consistent with the negative state relief model, it was expected that, relative to neutral mood subjects, children in a negative mood would be more generous if the helping opportunity offered the potential for direct reward through social approval. This expectation was supported in a pair of studies wherein children in Grades 1-3 were asked to imagine either neutral or sad experiences and were then given the opportunity to be charitable either in public or private. The second experiment provided evidence that the enhanced public helping of negative mood subjects is more parsimoniously interpreted as an attempt to remove negative mood than to repair public image. Finally, a three-step account of the development of altruism as a self-reward was proposed. Initially, helpfulness was found to be rare because it involved the loss of rewards. At the second step, children, usually those in primary grades, became aware that helping could lead to systematic social reinforcement, although they may be less helpful when in a negative mood. After sufficient experience with external reward for charitable action, the behavior itself assumes the quality of a secondary reinforcer occurring with increased frequency in all moods. (Author/BEF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED174928

A Step in the Socialization of Altruism as Hedonism: Effects of Negative Mood on Children's Generosity under Public and Private Conditions

Douglas T. Kenrick

Montana State University

Donald J. Baumann and Robert B. Cialdini

Arizona State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Douglas T. Kenrick

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The authors are grateful to Nancy Eisenberg-Berg, Susan Somerville, and Antoinette Zeiss for their critical comments on an earlier version of this article. Thanks are also due to the administration of Kyrene del Norte and Broadmor Elementary Schools, Tempe, Ariz., especially their principals Fredrick Gallow and Herbert Hackett. Requests for reprints should be addressed to: Douglas T. Kenrick, Dept. of Psychology, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT 59717.

CG013729

Running head: Effects of Negative Mood

A large number of studies have shown increased helping as a function of experiences that are likely to have induced negative moods in adult subjects (e.g., Aderman & Berkowitz, 1970; Apsler, 1975; Filter & Gross, 1975; Freedman & Doob, 1968; Freedman, Wallington & Bless, 1967; Greenglass, 1969; Kidd & Berkowitz, 1976; Konečni, 1972; Rawlings, 1968; Steele, 1975). Cialdini and his associates (Cialdini, Darby & Vincent, 1973; Cialdini & Kenrick, 1976) have suggested a negative state relief model of altruism to explain these data. According to this notion, altruistic behavior is self-gratifying and will serve to alleviate temporary negative mood states in the same way that any other mood-enhancing experience will. Such a notion is consistent with research demonstrating that negative mood will increase the likelihood of other forms of self-reward (Rosenhan, Underwood, & Moore, 1974; Underwood, Moore, & Rosenhan, 1973), and receives direct support from a study by Cialdini et al. (1973). These authors found that while a negative mood-inducing experience generally led to increased helping, this relationship did not hold for subjects who received a gratifying event (money or praise) between the negative experience and the helping opportunity. Apparently, the negative affective state was cancelled for these subjects by the application of a reinforcer, and it was no longer necessary to employ the helping response for that purpose.

In contrast to the studies showing a general tendency for mood-lowering procedures to lead to increased helping, there is a body of data indicating that such procedures typically lead

to some degree of decreased helping (e.g., Isen, Horn, & Rosenhan, 1973, studies 1 and 3; Moore, Underwood, & Rosenhan, 1973, Rosenhan, Underwood, & Moore, 1974; Underwood, Froming, & Moore, 1977). Cialdini and Kenrick (1976) sought to reconcile these seemingly discrepant findings by pointing out that the data showing a direct relationship between lowered mood and helping have come from adult subjects while the data failing to show such a relationship generally have come from work on children. Cialdini and Kenrick (1976) reviewed evidence to support the position that altruism acquires its self-reinforcing qualities as a function of the socialization process, wherein helping behavior is systematically paired with various forms of direct reinforcement (e.g., praise, reciprocated aid, thanks, etc.). On the basis of that review, it was expected that young children who had not completed the socialization experience would not find helping behavior gratifying and, hence, would not use it to dispel a negative mood state; however, it was expected that with age individuals would increasingly employ prosocial activity as a self-gratifier when in a negative mood. In support of these expectations, Cialdini and Kenrick (1976) found that the relationship between negative mood and helping progressively changed from an inverse to a direct one over three groups of increasingly older subjects, only the oldest (high school students) of whom showed significantly enhanced helping under negative mood.

One implication of the negative state relief formulation is that young children will not show enhanced helping while in a negative affective state unless the helping leads to some kind of direct, extrinsic reward (e.g., social approval). Rosenhan

(1970) has suggested that altruism can be divided into two categories: normative altruism, based on sanctions associated with social norms; and autonomous altruism, which occurs in the absence of external reward and which must be internalized. However, in the above-cited studies investigating the influence of negative mood on children's helping, only autonomous altruism has been examined, since the opportunity to behave charitably has always been anonymous. In keeping with the negative state relief formulation, we would expect that, were the helping situation to provide the opportunity for normative social reward, negative mood would increase help-giving in young children.

There are data to suggest that primary school children are aware of the normative sanctions for helping. For example, Ugurel-Semin (1952) found in 6-9 year old children an increasing recognition of the pressures exerted by norms and customs upon the decision to share. Similarly, Eisenberg-Berg (Note 1) found a substantial tendency for 7 and 9 year olds to employ social approval reasons as justification for prosocial action. Further, Bryan and Walbek (1970) found that the majority of their 8-9 year old subjects verbally indicated knowledge of the social desirability of helping to an adult experimenter. These authors found, however, that their subjects' verbalizations about the appropriateness of helping did not predict their actual generosity in the absence of the experimenter. Thus, it appears that while young children are aware that social approval is likely to follow their prosocial activity, they have not as yet internalized the norms for helping.

The present investigation was designed to test the hypothesis that primary school children should show increased

helping as a function of negative mood induction in a situation involving normative (or publicly observable) altruism, since the potential for external reinforcement would be present in the form of social approval. In the first experiment, first-through-third grade children were given either a private or public opportunity to behave charitably. In the public condition, an adult was present during an opportunity for the child to contribute some rewards to other children; in the private condition, no adult was present during this time. In accord with the negative state relief model, it was expected that negative mood would produce significant increases in the helping behavior of children, as it does for adults, but only in the public condition. That is, negative mood would serve to increase normative altruism, but not autonomous altruism, since children at this age would not be expected to have yet internalized the reward properties of prosocial behavior.

Experiment 1

Method

Subjects. Subjects were 72 first-through-third grade children (35 males, 37 females) from an elementary school in a middle class surburban area.

Procedure. The procedure used in the present investigation was identical to that used by Cialdini and Kenrick (1976) with two exceptions. These were the inclusion of a brief check on the mood manipulation and the introduction of a public helping condition.

Briefly, subjects were brought individually to an experimental room containing a table and chairs, books, a tape recorder, and a box labelled "Coupons for Other Students". Subjects were told that they would be participating in two separate tasks, an initial "hearing task" and a subsequent "imagination task". They were told that for their participation they would receive several coupons that could be exchanged for a valuable prize at the end of the week. It was stressed that larger accumulations of coupons would result in better prizes. The experimenter directed the subjects' attention to the sealed box and explained that they could donate some of their winnings to the other students who would not get a chance to participate in the experiments.

Subjects then performed a hearing task and were given 10 coupons for their participation. The first experimenter then left and a second experimenter, always the same sex as the subject, entered and began the imagination task, which constituted the mood manipulation. Each subject received 5 coupons before the onset of this task.

Mood manipulation. Half the subjects (negative mood) were asked to reminisce about a sad experience and half were asked to imagine a book and a chair (neutral mood). This was done in manner identical to Cialdini and Kenrick (1976), except that following the mood manipulation, subjects were asked, "Did what you just thought about make you feel better than you usually feel, about the same as you usually feel, or worse than you usually feel?" The sequence in which these possibilities were presented was counterbalanced across subjects. Responses were coded on a 1 - 3 scale, with 1 indicating the most positive response.

Helping opportunity. After the mood manipulation, the second experimenter left the room and the first experimenter (blind to the subject's mood condition) returned. In the private condition the experimenter explained that the tasks were done, and (while ostensibly re-setting the tape recorder) thanked the subject and said there would be a short delay before the subject would be accompanied back to the classroom. The experimenter again called attention to the box labelled "Coupons for Other Students", reminded the subject of the option to share coupons, and left the subject alone for 90 seconds.

In the public condition, the experimenter performed the same behaviors except that instead of leaving after the reminder, he or she remained in the room and observed the subject's behavior during the 90-second helping opportunity.

For ethical reasons, the experimenter had all negative mood subjects imagine happy events at the completion of the experiment. A second manipulation check procedure indicated that the negative mood was removed as a result. Subjects were then asked not to discuss the tests with any of their classmates until the end of the week.

Independent variables. Three factors were varied: mood (negative vs. neutral), type of helping opportunity (public vs. private), and sex of subject.

Dependent variables. Two dependent variables were employed. The subjects' responses to the mood manipulation check constituted one dependent variable. The major dependent variable was the mean number of coupons contributed per cell.

Predictions. It was expected that, for our young subjects,

helping would be substantially enhanced only when they were in a negative mood and the possibility of external reward existed. Consequently, the negative mood/public condition was predicted to produce more helping than the other three conditions, which were not expected to differ among themselves.

RESULTS

A 2x2x2 analysis of variance revealed that sex of subject had no effect on either dependent variable; thus the means for both the number of coupons contributed and the mood manipulation check are collapsed over sex and are presented in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Manipulation check. The results of the analysis of variance on the mood check item showed the predicted main effect for the mood induction. Mean values (displayed in Table 1) indicate that negative mood subjects indicated more negative feelings as a result of their ideations, $F(1,64) = 17.08$, $p < .001$. In addition, there was an unexpected interaction of mood induction with type of helping opportunity, $F(1,64) = 4.32$, $p < .05$, suggesting that the mood manipulation was somewhat more effective for subjects who were subsequently given a public helping opportunity. No other effects were significant for this variable.

Coupon sharing behavior. Since the prediction was made that the largest number of coupons would be contributed during a public helping opportunity following a negative mood induction, an a priori contrast (Hays, 1973, p. 466) was performed to test this prediction. This contrast pitted the public negative mood group

against the mean of all other groups. In addition, the residual between groups variance was tested to determine whether any remaining effects due to the independent variables existed. It was expected that the between groups variance for the a priori contrast would account for the majority of the variance.

Results indicated that the prediction was borne out. Subjects in the negative mood/public condition contributed substantially more coupons than did subjects in the other cells (means are displayed in Table 1.) The a priori contrast indicated that this effect was significant, $F(1,68) = 9.55$, $p < .003$. In addition this contrast accounted for 99% of the between groups variance, while the remaining comparisons testing all other orthogonal effects were nonsignificant ($F < 1$) and accounted for only 1% of the variance.

Discussion

As expected, subjects who were exposed to negative mood-inducing operations and who had the opportunity to help in the presence of an experimenter donated the most coupons. Negative mood subjects whose opportunity to help occurred in private, however, were not especially likely to share their coupons; in fact, they were slightly less generous as a result of the negative induction procedure, a result that is consistent with the prior literature involving anonymous giving in young children. It appears, then, that negative mood did not lead to increased helping in our young subjects unless the helping opportunity offered the likelihood of direct social reward for generosity. It is our argument that helping will be employed by individuals in a lowered

mood state in order to relieve their negative affective state. For adults, who have internalized the reward value of benevolence, the help may occur in private and still retain its self-gratifying function. For young children, on the other hand, altruism has not yet become autonomous and, thus, will be gratifying only when it is instrumental to an extrinsic form of reward like public approval.

The finding that our young subjects were more likely to help when in a negative mood and in public is compatible with some earlier results by Isen, Horn, and Rosenhan (1973). They found (Experiments 2 & 3) that a public failure had a positive effect upon young children's charitable donations made in the presence of an experimenter who knew of the failure. The authors accounted for the finding with an image repair explanation: The visible failing produced a lowered public image that subjects then sought to repair via prosocial action. Our own interpretation of these data would be somewhat different: The public failure produced a lowered mood that subjects then sought to remove via prosocial action. Setting aside the question of how to best interpret the Isen, Horn, Rosenhan (1973) results, the image repair notion of those authors presents a potential alternative explanation for the data of the present study. Perhaps, in asking negative mood subjects to reminisce aloud about a sad experience, we caused a large percentage of them to divulge image-damaging things about themselves. If so, the enhanced coupon donating that occurred in the negative mood/public condition may have been a result of attempts to raise a lowered public

image rather than to relieve a negative mood.

To test the negative state relief versus image repair interpretations of our findings, a second experiment designed to replicate and extend the results of Experiment 1 was conducted. A test of these alternative formulations gains importance because the image repair interpretation could account for many of the studies showing that certain negative mood procedures resulted in greater helping among adult subjects. Although Cialdini and Kenrick (1976) interpreted such results according to the negative state relief model, increased aid following a public transgression (e.g., Konečni, 1972), receipt of an insult (Steele, 1975), receipt of a deviant score on a personality test (Filter & Gross, 1975), or public embarrassment (Apsler, 1975) could conceivably have occurred in an attempt to restore public image. A second reason for performing a replication of Experiment 1 involved the unexpected interaction that appeared on our mood manipulation check in that study. Even though the means in Table 1 suggest that the mood induction procedure was successful for subjects who were subsequently randomly assigned to both public and private helping opportunity condition, the induction appears to have been stronger among those in the public cells. While the pattern of means makes it unlikely that this factor mediated our results, it was felt that confidence in the results of Experiment 1 would be enhanced by a replication showing equivalently strong negative mood induction among public and private condition subjects. To these ends, a replication of Experiment 1 was conducted that included an additional manipulated variable--whether

the negative mood induction procedure required subjects to imagine negative experiences that were image-related or image-unrelated.

Experiment 2

Method

Subjects. Subjects were 77 first-through-third grade children (42 males, 35 females) from an elementary school in a middle class surburban area. This was not the same school used in Experiment 1.

Procedure. The procedure was identical to that used in experiment 1 with the exception that subjects in the negative mood cells were divided into an image and a non-image condition. These conditions were operationalized in the following way: Experiences spontaneously generated by subjects in Experiment 1 were divided into image and non-image categories by two independent raters. There was 90% agreement between raters. The four most frequently occurring responses in each category had 100% agreement between raters and were selected for experimental conditions[1].

Negative mood was manipulated by asking one half of the subjects if they had ever experienced the most frequently occurring non-image related response while the other half were asked the same question about the most frequently occurring image-related response. If subjects responded "yes" to this first probe, the experimenter proceeded to induce a negative mood state in a manner identical to Experiment 1. If subjects responded "no" the experimenter continued down the list of image or non-image experiences until an affirmative response was generated. None

of the subjects responded "no" to all four probes.

Predictions. It was expected that helping would again be greatest in the negative mood/public condition, and that this effect would not vary as a function of the image manipulation.

RESULTS

A 3x2x2 analysis of variance again revealed that sex of subject had no effect on either dependent variable; thus, the means for these measures were collapsed over sex and can be found in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

Manipulation check. Once again, the manipulation check showed a significant main effect of the mood manipulation, $F(2,65) = 20.68$, $p < .001$. In this experiment, neither the type of helping opportunity, nor the interaction with mood induction was significant for this variable (both Fs < 1). No other effects approached significance.

Coupon sharing behavior. The initial 3x2x2 analysis of variance also revealed that no significant differences occurred as a function of the image manipulation (all Fs < 1). Examination of the means in Table 2 indicate that if anything, image-related negative mood led to relatively less helping than non-image-related negative mood.

Since there was no difference between the image and the non-image cells, the means for the major dependent measure were collapsed over type of negative mood induction, and the negative mood/public group was pitted against all other groups as in Experiment

1. Once again, results indicated most helping by subjects in the negative mood/public cell (see Table 2).[2] The *a priori* contrast for this effect was marginally significant, F (1,73) = 3.05, $p < .085$. Further examination of these results indicated that this contrast accounted for 90% of the between groups variance, while the remaining orthogonal comparisons were nonsignificant ($F < 1$) and accounted for 10% of the variance.

Rosenthal (1978) has recently reviewed a number of methods for combining the results of independent studies, suggesting that the most serviceable technique among those available is the method of adding Z-scores (Mosteller & Bush, 1954). When looked at in this manner, the combined results of Experiments 1 and 2 strongly support the hypothesis that the greatest coupon-sharing would occur in the negative mood/public condition, $Z = 2.96$, $p < .003$.

General Discussion

Taken together, the results of both experiments provided clear support for our major hypothesis. While primary-grade children in a situation requiring autonomous (i.e., internalized) altruism did not show the adult pattern of increased helping in a negative mood, the pattern shown in the public condition indicated that normative (i.e., sanction-based) helping was increased by negative mood. This latter outcome fits well with the findings indicating increased helping in adults (e.g., Apsler, 1975; Freedman et al, 1967; Cialdini et al., 1973) as well as increased direct self-reinforcement in children (Rosenhan et al., 1974; Underwood et al., 1973) as a function of negative mood induction.

Our results are also consistent with the Isen et al. (1973, study 3) finding that an image-damaging incident will lead to an increase in helping, although the present results do not seem to be explained via the image repair model.

It should be noted that the negative state relief model and the image repair model are in no way compatible. In fact, damage to image is doubtless one common and potent form of negative state inducement. It is our position, however, that image repair seems subsumed under the more general negative state relief model. Image damage is, thus, sufficient but not necessary to lead to increases in normative helping. Other negative experiences will have the same result. Further, research by Cialdini et al. (1973) has indicated that relief of a negative mood state abolishes the negative-mood-leads-to-helping relationship even when such relief is in no way related to image improvement.

A further point of clarification regarding the negative state relief model should be made here. The model suggests that one helps when one is experiencing a transitory feeling of sadness or depression in order to feel better. As indicated in previous statements of the model, (Cialdini et al., 1973; Cialdini & Kenrick, 1976) negative experiences likely to arouse feelings of frustration or anger would not be expected to result in altruistic behavior. Additionally, if the helping is effortful, or unlikely to yield great benefit, negative mood might be expected to reduce helping even in adults. This latter suggestion is supported in a recent paper by Weyant (in press). He found that a negative mood induction increased helping in his subjects, but only when the cost of helping was low, and the potential benefits were high. Conversely, when

cost of helping was high but potential benefits were low, helping was somewhat decreased by negative mood. There is, additionally, some recent evidence that negative mood can sometimes reduce helping by producing an attentional deficit. McMillen, Sanders and Solomon (1977) found that negative mood subjects were less attentive to their environment than neutral mood subjects and, consistently, were less helpful to a female confederate's distress, unless she drew attention to herself. In the latter condition, negative mood produced greater helping than either neutral or positive mood conditions.[3] The tendency to engage in altruistic behavior as a means of self-reward following negative state inducement then, seems to be mediated by the reward value and the salience of the helping opportunity. In keeping with the hedonistic basis of the model, it appears that if a helping opportunity is not perceived as likely to lead to a better mood, negative mood will not enhance helping. These findings are consistent with the notion that helping will occur in a negative mood in order to alleviate such aversive feelings.

It was interesting that, while means for helping in the public conditions were invariably higher than those in the relevant private comparison, the public-private effect was not more pronounced in the neutral mood conditions. It would seem that the children generally judged the value of the unknown prize to be potentially more valuable than the immediate social approval of the experimenter, but that negative mood enhanced the importance of such immediate approval.

It will be recalled that the Cialdini and Kenrick (1976) data indicate that the relationship between helping and negative mood

changes from an inverse to a direct one as an individual passes through the socialization process. When those data are taken in combination with the results of the present investigations, a 3-step model of the socialization of altruism as a self-reward emerges. Initially, helpful behavior would be rarely performed by an unsocialized individual, since it involves the loss of rewards. There is substantial evidence that preschool age children help infrequently and that, when they do help, it is unrelated to social approval (Eisenberg-Berg, Note 2, Fischer, 1963, Ugurel-Semin, 1952). At this first step, helpfulness would be unlikely under most circumstances, and even more unlikely under conditions of negative mood, since it would be experienced as self-punishment.

The second step involves children's acquisition of the norms for prosocial behavior, without concomitant internalization of these norms. Children at this step, usually in the primary grades, are aware that helping can lead to systematic social reinforcement (Bryan & Walbek, 1970; Eisenberg-Berg, Note 1; Ugurel-Semin, 1952) and employ a public helping opportunity to obtain external social reward when in a negative mood, as suggested by the data of the present studies. However, such children may still tend to be less helpful under negative mood when their helpfulness is anonymous (Cialdini & Kenrick, 1976; Moore et al., 1973; Rosenhan et al., 1974; Underwood et al., 1977).

Finally after sufficient experience with external reward for charitable action, that behavior itself takes on the quality of a secondary reinforcer (Weiss, Buchanan, Alstatt, & Lombardo, 1971) and occurs with enhanced frequency under conditions of negative affect (see Cialdini & Kenrick, 1976 for a review), presumably to dispel the bad mood. For the individual who has reached this

level of socialization, usually by high school age, helpfulness will have become self-gratifying and will frequently occur privately without the expectation of material or social reward.

Footnotes

[1]The non-image condition contained the following experiences: 1) Have you ever had a pet you owned die? 2) Have you ever had a toy you liked broken, lost or stolen? 3) Have you ever been hurt in an accident? 4) Have you ever had someone you like very much move away? The image condition included: 1) Have you ever been called a bad name? 2) Have you ever been caught doing something wrong? 3) Have you ever been punished for doing something wrong? 4) Have you ever been left out of a game you wanted to be in?

[2]As the means in Table 2 also indicate, an analysis of variance revealed a trend toward a main effect for type of helping opportunity, $F(1,65)=2.42$, $p < .12$, with public opportunity to help producing somewhat more aid. A similar trend was found in Study 1, $F(1,64)=3.72$, $p < .058$.

[3]Another recent study by Underwood er al. (1977) failed to find increased helping in negative mood subjects as a function of an attention manipulation, and these authors' suggestions may be compatible with Weyant's (in press) more recent findings. They propose that negative mood subjects may simply not have perceived a great need of help. Unfortunately, since mood induction was accomplished by using subjects who were leaving movie theatres and had observed very different films, it is possible that a number of uncontrolled factors may have been operative in this study. Further research is needed to clarify the contradiction between the Underwood et al. (1977) and McMillen et al. (1977) studies.

Reference Notes

1. Eisenberg-Berg, N. The development of prosocial moral judgment and its correlates. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of California, Berkeley, 1977.

2. Eisenberg-Berg, N. The relationship of preschoolers' reasoning about prosocial moral conflicts to prosocial behavior. Unpublished manuscript, Arizona State University, 1978.

References

Aderman, D., & Berkowitz, L. Observational set, empathy, and helping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 14, 141-148.

Apsler, R. Effects of embarrassment on behavior toward others. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 145-153.

Bryan, J.H., & Walbek, N.H. Preaching and practicing generosity: Children's actions and reactions. Child Development, 1970, 41, 329-353.

Cialdini, R.B., Darby, B.L., & Vincent, J.E. Transgression and altruism: A case for hedonism. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1973, 9, 502-516.

Cialdini, R.B., & Kenrick, D.T. Altruism as hedonism: A social development perspective on the relationship of negative mood state and helping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 907-914.

Filter, T.A., & Gross, A.E. Effects of public and private deviancy on compliance with a request. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1975, 11, 553-559.

Fischer, W.F. Sharing in preschool children as a function of amount and type of reinforcement. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1963, 68, 215-245.

Freedman, J.L., & Doob, A.N. Deviance: The psychology of being different. New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Freedman, J.L., Wallington, S.A., & Bless, E. Compliance without pressure: The effects of guilt. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 7, 117-124.

Greenglass, E. R. Effects of prior help and hindrance on willingness to help another: Reciprocity or social responsibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 11, 224-231.

Hays, W. L. Statistics for psychologists. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963.

Isen, A. M., Horn, N., & Rosenhan, D. L. Effects of success and failure on children's generosity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 27, 239-247.

Kidd, R. F., & Berkowitz, L. Dissonance, self-concept, and helpfulness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 33, 613-622

Konečni, V. J. Some effects of guilt on compliance: A field replication. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 23, 30-32.

McMillen, D. L., Sanders, D. Y. & Solomon, G. S. Self esteem, attentiveness, and helping behavior. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1977, 3, 257-261.

Moore, B., Underwood, B., & Rosenhan, D. L. Affect and altruism. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 8, 99-104.

Mosteller, F. M., & Bush, R. R. Selected quantitative techniques. In G. Lindzey, (Ed.) Handbook of social psychology: Volume I. Theory and method. Cambridge, Mass., Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Rawlings, E. I. Witnessing harm to others: A reassessment of the role of guilt in altruistic behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 377-380.

Rosenhan, D. Some origins of concern for others. In P. Mussen, J. Langer, & M. Covington (Eds.), Trends and issues in developmental psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970.

Rosenhan, D. L., Underwood, B., & Moore, B. Affect moderates self-gratification and altruism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 30, 546-552.

Rosenthal, R. Combining results of independent studies. Psychological Bulletin, 1978, 85, 185-193.

Steele, C. M. Name-calling and compliance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 361-369.

Ugurel-Semin, R. Moral behavior and Moral judgement of children. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 463-474.

Underwood, B., Berenson, J. F., Berenson, R. J., Cheng, K. K., Wilson, D., Kulick, J., Moore, B. S., Wensel, G. Attention, negative affect, and altruism: An ecological validation. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1977, 3, 54-58.

Underwood, B., Froming, W. J., & Moore, B. S. Mood, attention and altruism: A search for mediating variables. Developmental Psychology, 1977, 13, 541-542.

Underwood, B., Moore, B. S., & Rosenhan, D. L. Affect and self-gratification. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 8, 209-214.

Weiss, R. F., Buchanan, W., Alstatt, L., & Lombardo, J. P. Altruism is rewarding. Science, 1971, 171, 1262-1263.

Weyant, J. M. The effects of mood states, costs and benefits on helping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, in press.

Table 1

Mood and Helping Scores

for Experiment 1

	Type of Helping Opportunity			
	Private		Public	
	Neutral Mood	Negative Mood	Neutral Mood	Negative Mood
Mood check[a]	1.72	2.06	1.50	2.55
M Coupons Contributed	1.44	1.22	1.50	3.50

[a]The higher the score, the more negative the mood.
Note: *N* per cell = 18.

Table 2

Mood and Helping Scores

for Experiment 2

	Private			Public		
	Neutral Mood	Negative Mood		Neutral Mood	Negative Mood	
		Nonimage	Image		Nonimage	Image
Mood Check[a]	1.92	2.66	2.72	1.68	2.69	2.78
M Coupons Contributed	1.39	2.00	1.00	2.07	3.15	2.93
N	13	12	11	14	13	14

[a]The higher the score, the more negative the mood.